

Application No.: 10/652,100
Filing Date: August 28, 2003

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None.

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 1, 5, 6, 14, 24, and 53.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0108587 (“Orgill”), U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0050594 (“Zamierowski”), and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0014025 (“Allen”) were discussed.

Proposed Amendments

Proposed amendments to Claims 1, 5, 6, 24, and 53 were discussed.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Applicant’s counsel argued that the amended Claims 1, 5, and 53 are allowable over the prior art references cited in the present rejection. Applicant also argued that amended Claim 6, and Claim 14 as previously presented, are allowable over the prior art references cited in the present rejection. Applicant’s counsel and Examiner discussed the proposed amendment to Claim 24, specifying that the temperature monitor is “positioned within the periphery of the cover.” The Examiner indicated that such an amendment appeared to distinguish over Orgill. With respect to the proposed combination of Orgill and Allen, Applicant explained why the absorbent material in Allen is non-analogous art, and would not be combined with Orgill with any reasonable expectation of success.

Results of Interview

The amendments discussed regarding Claims 1, 5, and 53 appear to overcome the present rejection. The Examiner indicated that she would review the amendments and arguments with respect to Claims 6, 14 and 24 as provided in the present response.